REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bell (US patent 5, 930, 340, hereinafter referred to as "Bell")and Deutsche et al. (US patent 5, 577, 115, hereinafter referred to as "Deutsche"). With respect to claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Bell teaches all of its elements but is not explicit about a "premise output" in the sense of the claim and then proceeds to rely upon Deutsch for a teaching of the premise output. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to combine the teachings of Bell and Deutsch so as to arrive at the claimed invention.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection and asserts that the Examiner has not made a prima facie showing of obviousness in the cited references. Claim 1 requires, a communications module comprising, inter alia, an input for receiving a communication line containing data and voice communication services; a modem output for passing the voice and data services to a modem; and a modem input for receiving only the voice service from the modem. In contradistinction, Bell teaches a system for isolating voice and data signals transmitted on an internal telephone wiring network wherein a splitter/filter arrangement 127 is provided at the point of connection to the internal telephone wire network 125 and connected to each voice and data device. In the passage cited by the Examiner in columns 5 and 6 of the reference, Bell clearly teaches the splitter/filter arrangement 127 as filtering out voice band signals and/or data band signals as the signals are passed from the internal telephone wire network 125 to the respective devices such as a modem for data or a telephone 121 for voice. In Bell's system, both a splitter 107 at the central office and a splitter 127 at a customer premise are required. Such a system presents the very problem which the invention seeks to solve. The

Examiner's attention is directed to the background section of the application beginning on page 1 line 22 which recites:

> "…At both the central office and the subscriber premise, a splitter is required to separate the voice communication from the data communication. The splitter serves to couple voice signals to a twisted-pair phone line and data signals to a twisted-pair data line. A DSL modem is connected to the twisted-pair data line at each end and a telephone is connected to the twisted-pair phone line at the subscriber premise.
>
> A problem exists with such systems in that the separate splitter is required at the subscriber premise for separating the data and voice signals…"

Turning next to page 8 of the application beginning at line 21, an advantage of the invention is recited wherein primary and secondary telephone lines are passed through the modem before the telephones to allow filtering of the data signals. "This is accomplished without the need for a separate splitter, which is otherwise required to separate the voice and data communications."

Bell does not teach nor suggest a communications module which receives a communication line containing data and voice at an input, passes voice and data services to a modem through a modem output, receives only the voice service from the modem at a modem input and then passes only the voice service to a premise output. Bell, in fact, teaches away from the solution presented by the invention by teaching a system which requires a separate splitter at the customer premise which is not required to be part of the claimed communications module. Bell does not teach nor suggest any single device which both outputs voice and data to a modem and receives a modem input of only voice service from the modem. In contradistinction, the splitter/filter 127 of Bell passes either data or voice to/from a device but does not pass data to a

modem and then receive only voice from the modem essentially relying on the modem for filtering instead of a splitter 127.

That which Bell lacks, Deutsche neither teaches nor suggests. The Examiner's attention is directed to the Applicant's response of September 30, 2005 for a more thorough analysis of Deutsche which will not be repeated here for brevity. For these reasons, the Applicant asserts that the Examiner has not made a prima facie showing of obviousness and therefore respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and those that depend therefrom, namely claims 2-5.

Regarding claim 6, the Examiner once again asserts that Bell teaches the communications module having a modem output as recited, modem input as recited and correctly indicates that Bell lacks a teaching of a security interface. The Examiner proceeds to rely on Deutsche for a teaching of the security interface. For the reasons discussed above, Bell does not teach nor suggest a communications module which receives a communication line containing data and voice at an input, passes voice and data services to a modem through a modem output, receives only the voice service from the modem at a modem input and then passes only the voice service to a premise output. These elements which Bell lacks, Deutsche neither teaches nor suggests. Therefore, the Applicant asserts that the Examiner has not made a prima facie showing of obviousness using these references. The Applicant also asserts that the Examiner's reliance upon a CPE interface 39 and interface recognition switch 40 in Deutsche is misguided. Deutsche does not teach nor suggest any interface to a security system. In contradistinction, the interface 39 of Deutsche is to customer premise equipment and does not meet the claim limitation of passing a selected communication line to a security system or receiving the selected communication line

from the security system. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6-11 is therefore respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 12, the Examiner asserts that Bell teaches the communications module having output means for passing the plurality of services to outlets in the premise wiring system; filter interface means connected between the input means and the output means for passing selected services to a filter; and,… the output means for passing selected voice service to a security system. The Examiner proceeds to rely on Deutsche for a teaching of the security interface means being connected between the filter interface means. The Applicant asserts that the Examiner's reliance upon a CPE interface 39 and interface recognition switch 40 in Deutsche is misguided. Deutsche does not teach nor suggest any interface to a security system and does not teach nor suggest a security system interface means connected between the filter interface means and the output means for passing selected voice service to a security system. In contradistinction, the interface 39 of Deutsche is a customer premise equipment interface and does not meet the claim limitation of the security system interface means being connected between the filter interface means and the output means for passing selected voice service to a security system. In fact, the interface 39 of Deutsche is connected at an input to a customer premise as opposed to between a filter and an output. Therefore, the Applicant asserts that the Examiner has not made a prima facie showing of obviousness using these references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12-16 is therefore respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 17, Examiner asserts that Bell teaches a process of distributing voice and data signals in a premise wiring system, comprising the steps of: receiving combined voice and data signals in a module; filtering the voice and data signals to separate the voice signals

from the data signals wherein the step of filtering comprises sending the combined voice and data signals from the module to a modem and sending only the voice signals from the modem back to the module. The Examiner correctly indicates that the passages of Bell are not explicit about distributing the filtered voice signals from the module in the sense of the claim and then proceeds to rely upon Deutsche for teaching these features.

Bell does not teach nor suggest a process of distributing voice and data signals in a premise wiring system wherein combined data and voice signals are received in a module and separated by passing both signals from the module to a modem and sending only the voice signals from the modem back to the module. Bell, in fact, teaches away from the solution presented by the invention by teaching a process requiring separate filters 127 in the customer premise connected to each data or voice device which is not required to be part of the claimed communications module. Bell does not teach nor suggest any single device which both outputs voice and data to a modem and receives a modem filtered voice input from the modem. In contradistinction, the filter 127 of Bell passes either data or voice to/from a device but does not pass data to a modem and then receive only voice back from the modem essentially relying on the modem for filtering instead of a filter 127.

That which Bell lacks, Deutsche neither teaches nor suggests. The Examiner's attention is directed to the Applicant's response of September 30, 2005 for a more thorough analysis of Deutsche which will not be repeated here for brevity. For these reasons, the Applicant asserts that the Examiner has not made a prima facie showing of obviousness and therefore respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 17.

For all of the foregoing reasons and in view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully contend that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and passage to issue therefore requested. Please charge any additional requisite fees relating to this amendment and response to Deposit Account No. 501581.

Respectfully submitted,

/sa/
Salvatore Anastasi
Registration No. 39,090
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Phone: (610) 722-3899
Facsimile: (610) 889-3696